

Col. Wm. Burton, Herb J. Tom, Adelson, Lucio

September 27, 1968

Mr. George W. Healy
Executive Editor, The Times-Picayune
3800 Howard Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana

Sir:

Your clear purpose seems to be to defame me and to mislead your readers into believing the fairy tale of the Warren Report is reality. You continue your campaign of error and misrepresentation, again turn your columns over to a man who, through red-colored glasses, insists he sees what is not there, and, I think, in your September 24 issue, again libel me.

Using the disreputable racist Carlos Bringuier as your vehicle, you call me a liar when you fully know better. As our previous correspondence so clearly shows, if you had any question about the fact already in your possession, the answer and the truth were readily available to you.

The question is not at all when Bringuier filed that repetitious legal fiction of his, which is something he alone had control over, but whether, after publication of the book that fails to do him full justice (you see, I can err, but I did not, in the direction he says), he could have served notice of a suit upon me. Your paper is in possession of irrefutable proof that I was thereafter, very publicly, in New Orleans, on many occasions. It interviewed me, though it printed no story. Your reporters met and spoke with me, quite publicly, on many occasions. Some were with me socially. You have personal knowledge that Bringuier did know I was in New Orleans during this period because he so informed you after he made a contemptuous attempt to prostitute law and the courts to his improper end. To your credit is your refusal to be part of that miserable performance. But you did know about it. You did know that Bringuier did have the United States marshal serve a fraudulent paper on me after misrepresenting it to both the federal court, which refused it, and to the marshal. He did serve me - but with a debasement of the judicial process, a fraudulent paper.

Moreover, in the event you had forgotten, before you printed this newest defamation, I wrote reminding you and, going further, told you where you could get both first-hand knowledge and the paper itself.

It is utterly false, as you know it to be, to declare, allege or infer in any way that Bringuier could not have served me. It is willful libel for you, on the basis of his misrepresentation - I emphasize, known to you to be a misrepresentation - to tell your readers I am a liar. This is precisely what you have now done.

There are other, typical, errors, reflecting bias and intent to defame, such as the untruthful headline, "Statements by Weisberg are Refuted". There is no refutation at all.

Mr. Healy - 2

There is not, as you say, a single suit against me and all the others you named. There never has been, in any court, anywhere. Two of those you name have nothing to do with OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS and never did.

You know, though again you did not report it, that Bringuier had been told by federal court his pretense of service on other defendants was spurious, that he had been ordered to effect proper service when he had attempted unsuccessfully to withdraw that suit. You know that his legal fictions were removed from state court by federal court and that they are already res judicata; that is, already decided, and against him. You further knew, for I so told you in advance and the public records are available to you, that no attempt, not even a frivolous one, has been made to serve me. Your reporting, in the face of this, even for you, is quite shocking and reveals what I am now convinced is your clear intent.

Had you any question at all, you could have phoned me. You did not, even though I reminded you this failure to follow normal newspaper practice compounded your initial error.

When you know the issue has already been decided in Louisiana courts, to conclude your story as you do, with a quotation falsely saying the opposite, is but further imposition on the trust of your captive readers and intended additional defamation of me.

You also know that any ill-intentioned jerk can file a suit for the payment of the nominal fees and that, to a degree, this can make for defamation of the falsely accused. Accurate reporting of such proceedings is immune to suit, as it must be. This galls Bringuier, for my reporting of the sworn testimony about him and I underline by him is well known. However, your practice is consistent with hurtful intent, and not alone in this case. For example, it was quite a news story to you when Clay Shaw's attorneys quite falsely, and knowing it to be false, accused me of being part of a conspiracy with Jim Garrison allegedly to deny their client his rights. However, when his moment of truth came, with no limit on the witnesses he could subpoena, whose attendance upon court he could compel and whose testimony under oath and penalty of perjury he could require, and when he, in fact, summoned about 30, some from as far away as California, he did not subpoena me. You did not note this. You allow the libel to remain uncorrected. According to your paper, which now certainly knows better and knows that Shaw's counsel knew better, I remain falsely charged with a crime, conspiracy.

Bringuier further describes my simple statement of the truth he finds so uncongenial, it being such a stranger to him, as an "attempt by Mr. Weisberg to discredit my lawyers". That, sir, is a totally unnecessary endeavor, what little doubt they permit to exist having more than adequately been cared for by their client.

The problem of a man who is without funds and in need of legal representation is not a simple one. When I can solve it, there will be further, and this time proper, utilization of the Louisiana courts, entirely different proceedings, not already decided.

Your total departure from reality is well illustrated in your final paragraph, wherein I am accused of trying the case in the newspapers rather than the court. You very well know that there have been a long

Mr. Healy - 3

series of proper, judicial decisions, each and every one in my favor and suppressed by you, who have monopoly control of the New Orleans newspapers. When Bringuier filed his initial suit, that was news (you did not ask for my comment). When it was thrown out of court for cause, you did not report it. When he tried to reinstitute the same suit, without correcting even the spelling or factual errors, word for word the same, and lost in a series of decisions, you did not concern yourself. Only his shysterism is worthy of your note, only when you can defame me.

You, who suppressed knowledge even of the existence of my book, say I tried the case in your newspapers? Even for you this is too much!

Sincerely,

Harold Weissberg